



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/078,499	02/21/2002	Takashi Tsue	Q66587	4701

7590 04/06/2006

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,  
MACKPEAK & SEAS, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037-3202

EXAMINER

PAPANIKOLAOU, ATHANASIOS T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/078,499

Applicant(s)

TSUE ET AL.

Examiner

Athanasios Tom Papanikolaou

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 2/2/06, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1-18**, in addition to newly added **claims 19-24**, are pending.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 2/2/06, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-18, cited in the Office Action dated 11/2/05 as being anticipated by Sasaki (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0105016), have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the arguments regarding the rejection of claim 1, applicant argues on pages 10-11 that Sasaki fails to teach of *sequentially dividing image data into small blocks of image data, each having a data volume according to the characteristics of an image process to be performed*. The examiner agrees that claim 27 and figure 3 do not specifically indicate a data volume in relation to the characteristics of the image process to be performed. However, upon further inspection, the examiner notes that the RPU (real-time processing unit ) in figure 3 performs processing on a single pixel block in element 41 and performs multi-line block processing in relation to element 42 which is further explained in paragraph 140, lines 15-24. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art can recognize the system of Sasaki does teach image data is divided in blocks with a data volume according to their respective processing modules.

Therefore, the rejection of independent claim 1 cited in the Office action dated 11/2/05, under 35 U.S.C 102(e), as being anticipated by Sasaki, is maintained in this Office Action.

### ***Specification***

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: Sequential Segmentation of Image Data into Blocks in Accordance with Image Processing to be Performed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -  
(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sasaki (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0105016 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Sasaki discloses **a method of processing images, wherein inputted image data is subjected to image processes and the processed image data is outputted, comprising the steps of sequentially dividing inputted image**

**data into small blocks of image data, each having a data volume according to the characteristics of an image process be performed, sequentially performing an image process on said small blocks of image data sequentially obtain small blocks of processed image data** (the RPU in figure 3 performs a first processing on a single pixel block in element 41 and performs subsequent processing of multi-line blocks in relation to element 42 which is further explained in paragraph 140, lines 15-24), **and sequentially outputting said small blocks of processed image data to an output destination** (fig 2 and paragraph 4).

Regarding claim 3, Sasaki discloses the limitations of claim 1 as stated above and further teaches **said inputted image data is cached, and said cached inputted imaged data is divided into the small blocks of image data** (fig 2, element 29a and 23: RPU performs segmenting according to processing).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Yokoyama (U.S. Patent 5,381,163).

Sasaki discloses **the method above in claim 1**.

Sasaki does not disclose expressly **said inputted image data is divided into said small blocks of data in accordance with the access characteristics of said inputted image data.**

Yokoyama discloses **said inputted image data is divided into said small blocks of data in accordance with the access characteristics of said inputted image data** (see abstract).

Sasaki and Yokoyama are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Sasaki's method include dividing the image data into blocks according to the characteristics of the inputted image data, as taught by Yokoyama. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Sasaki's system could divide the image data into segments while maintaining the functionality of the original input data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Yokoyama with the method of Sasaki to obtain the invention in claim 2.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Shiraiwa (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0162695 A1).

Sasaki discloses the method above in claim 1 and **said processed small blocks of image data are sequentially cached** (see Fig. 2).

Sasaki does not disclose expressly **and output data is outputted from said cached small blocks of processed image data, according to the characteristics of the output destination.**

Shiraiwa discloses **and output data is outputted from said cached small blocks of processed image data, according to the characteristics of the output destination** (paragraph 30).

Sasaki and Shiraiwa are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Sasaki's method include outputting the processed data according to the characteristics of the output location, as taught by Yokoyama. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Sasaki' system could send the image data in a compatible format with the output destination. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Shiraiwa with the method of Sasaki to obtain the invention in claim 4.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Ohta (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0051230 A1), and further in view of Redd et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0190400 A1).

Sasaki discloses the method above in claim 1.

Sasaki does not disclose expressly **wherein the image processes are performed in accordance with the characteristics of the inputted image data.**

Ohta discloses **wherein the image processes are performed in accordance with the characteristics of the inputted image data** (see abstract and paragraph 41).

Sasaki and Ohta are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image processing. At the time of the invention it would have been

Art Unit: 2625

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Sasaki's method include image processing according to the characteristics of the inputted data, as taught by Ohta. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Sasaki's system could provide flexibility in processing a wide variety of image data types. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Ohta with the method of Sasaki to obtain the invention in claim 4.

Continuing, Sasaki and Ohta both fail to expressly disclose **and/or the characteristics of the output destination**.

Redd discloses **and/or the characteristics of the output destination** (paragraph 100).

Sasaki, Ohta, and Redd are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Sasaki and Ohta's method include image processing according to the characteristics of the inputted data, as taught by Redd. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Sasaki and Ohta's method would have flexibility in processing image data to a variety of output destinations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Redd with the method of Sasaki and Ohta to obtain the invention in claim 5.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Redd.

Sasaki discloses the method above in claim 1.



Sasaki does not disclose expressly a **determination is made as to whether not the image process dependent on the output destination is valid or not, based on the characteristics of the input destination of the inputted image data and the output characteristics of the output destination, and for cases in which it is determined that the image process dependent on the output destination is valid, the processing dependent on said output destination is substituted for the aforementioned processing.**

Redd discloses a **determination is made as to whether not the image process dependent on the output destination is valid or not, based on the characteristics of the input destination of the inputted image data and the output characteristics of the output destination, and for cases in which it is determined that the image process dependent on the output destination is valid, the processing dependent on said output destination is substituted for the aforementioned processing (paragraph 100).**

Sasaki and Redd are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Sasaki's method include determining if the image process is compatible with the output and subsequently using the image process that is compatible with the output, as taught by Redd. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Sasaki' system could send the image data in a compatible format with the output destination. Therefore, it would

have been obvious to combine the teachings of Redd with the method of Sasaki to obtain the invention in claim 6.

9. Claims 7 through 12 recite identical features as claims 1 through 6, respectively, except claims 7-12 are apparatus claims. Thus arguments similar to that presented above for claims 1-6 are equally applicable to claims 7-12.

10. Claims 13 through 18 recite identical features as claims 1 through 6 except claims 13-18 are computer readable medium claims. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claims 1-6 are equally applicable to claims 13-18 because without a computer readable medium to store a program that makes it possible for the systems to operate (the systems taught by Sasaki, Ohta, Yokoyama, Shiraiwa, and Redd), the rejections for claims 1-6 could not function.

11. Claim(s) 19, 20, 21 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent 4,661,987).

Regarding claim 19, Sasaki discloses the dependency of claim 1, as stated above, but does not disclose expressly **wherein the step of sequentially dividing the inputted image data into small blocks of image data comprises receiving the inputted image data line by line at a first memory and the step of sequentially performing the image process comprises: first processing a1 lines of the inputted image data to generate first data when b lines of image data have been received**

**at the first memory,  $b$  being greater than  $a_1$ ; storing the first data in a second memory; and second processing  $a_2$  lines of the first data stored in the second memory.**

However, Anderson discloses wherein the step of sequentially dividing the inputted image data into small blocks of image data comprises receiving the inputted image data line by line at a first memory and the step of sequentially performing the image process comprises: first processing  $a_1$  lines of the inputted image data to generate first data when  $b$  lines of image data have been received at the first memory,  $b$  being greater than  $a_1$ ; storing the first data in a second memory; and second processing  $a_2$  lines of the first data stored in the second memory (abstract, col 3 lines 27-62, and fig 1).

Sasaki and Anderson are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Sasaki's system include sequentially processing portions of image data using cascading memories, as taught by Anderson. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Sasaki's system could process image data in a sequential fashion so as to improve speed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Anderson with the system of Sasaki to obtain the invention in claim 19.

Regarding claim 20, Sasaki and Anderson disclose the dependency of claim 19, as stated above, but Sasaki does not disclose expressly **wherein the first processing is x direction enlargement and the second processing is y direction enlargement**.

However, Anderson discloses **wherein the first processing is x direction enlargement and the second processing is y direction enlargement** (col 3 lines 51-53, fig 5C, and fig 1 elements 45 and 49).

Sasaki and Anderson are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Sasaki's system include a first processing in a horizontal direction and a second process in a vertical direction, as taught by Anderson. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Sasaki's system could process image data by using a well known enlarging technique. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Anderson with the system of Sasaki to obtain the invention in claim 20.

Regarding claim 21, Sasaki and Anderson disclose the dependency of claim 19, as stated above, and Sasaki further teaches **wherein the first processing is color space conversion and the second processing is resolution conversion** (fig 3 elements 43 and 45).

12. Claim(s) 22, 23, and 24 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Sasaki.

Regarding claim 22, Anderson discloses a method of processing an image divided into a plurality of portions comprising a first portion, a second portion and a third portion, said method comprising the steps of: storing the first portion in a first memory; first processing the first portion stored in the first memory in a first image process to generate a processed first portion and storing the second portion in the first memory, the operation of first processing the first portion and the operation of receiving the second portion in the first memory substantially occurring in parallel; storing the processed first portion in a second memory; and second processing a portion of the processed first portion stored in the second memory in a second image process, first processing the second portion stored in the first memory in the first image process and storing the third portion in the first memory, the operation of second processing the portion of the processed first portion, the operation of first processing the second portion and the operation of storing the third portion in the first memory substantially occurring in parallel... (abstract, col 3 lines 27-62, and fig 1: claim 22 recites nearly identical limitations as claim 19, with the exception of an added third portion which is inherent to the system along with any number of additional successive portions to complete the processing of an entire image).

Anderson does not disclose expressly...wherein each of the first portion, the second portion and the third portion has a corresponding image data having a data volume according to characteristics of at least one of the first image process and a second image process.

However, Sasaki discloses ...**wherein each of the first portion, the second portion and the third portion has a corresponding image data having a data volume according to characteristics of at least one of the first image process and a second image process** (the RPU in figure 3 performs a first processing on a single pixel block in element 41 and performs subsequent processing of multi-line blocks in relation to element 42 which is further explained in paragraph 140, lines 15-24).

Anderson and Sasaki are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Anderson's system include segmentation in accordance with the processing, as taught by Sasaki. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Anderson's system could divide image data into optimum sized blocks for a particular processing function therefore improving speed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Sasaki with the system of Anderson to obtain the invention in claim 22.

Regarding claim 23, Anderson and Sasaki disclose the dependency of claim 22, as stated above, and Anderson further teaches **wherein the first image process is x direction enlargement and the second image process is y direction enlargement** (col 3 lines 51-53, fig 5C, and fig 1 elements 45 and 49).

Regarding claim 24, Anderson and Sasaki disclose the dependency of claim 22, as stated above, but Anderson does not disclose expressly **wherein the first image**

Art Unit: 2625

**process is color space conversion and the second image process is resolution conversion.**

However, Sasaki discloses **wherein the first image process is color space conversion and the second image process is resolution conversion** (fig 3 elements 43 and 45).

Anderson and Sasaki are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Anderson's system include color space conversion and resolution conversion, as taught by Sasaki. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Anderson's system could logically first perform a color conversion and then adjust the resolution of the color converted image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Sasaki with the system of Anderson to obtain the invention in claim 23.

13. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Yokoyama and further in view of Prakash et al. (U.S. Patent 6,778,698).

Regarding claim 25, Sasaki and Yokoyama disclose the dependency of claim 2, as stated above, but Sasaki and Yokoyama do not disclose expressly **wherein the access characteristics of said inputted image data comprises format type of image data.**

However, Prakash discloses **wherein the access characteristics of said inputted image data comprises format type of image data** (col 5 lines 10-21).

Sasaki, Yokoyama, and Prakash are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Sasaki and Yokoyama's system include dividing image data in accordance the format of the image type, as taught by Prakash. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Sasaki and Yokoyama's system could flexibly and efficiently segment image data according to a variety of popular image formats. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Sasaki with the system of Anderson to obtain the invention in claim 25.

Regarding claim 26, Sasaki and Yokoyama disclose the dependency of claim 2, as stated above, but Sasaki and Yokoyama do not disclose expressly **wherein the access characteristics of said inputted image data comprises format type of image data**.

However, Prakash discloses **wherein the access characteristics of said inputted image data comprises format type of image data** (col 5 lines 10-21).

Sasaki, Yokoyama, and Prakash are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Sasaki and Yokoyama's system include dividing image data in accordance the format of the image



Art Unit: 2625

type including JPEG format, bitmap format and RAW format, as taught by Prakash. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Sasaki and Yokoyama's system could flexibly and efficiently segment image data according to a variety of popular image formats. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Sasaki with the system of Anderson to obtain the invention in claim 26.

### ***Conclusion***

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Athanasios Tom Papanikolaou whose telephone number is (571)272-7953. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 a.m-5 p.m..

Art Unit: 2625

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ed Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Athanasios Papanikolaou

JOSEPH R. POKRZYWA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART DIVISION 2625  
